

Unification of gauge coupling constants in the minimal supersymmetric model with $\alpha_s \approx 0.11$

A. K. Chaudhuri*

Variable Energy Cyclotron Centre
1/AF, Bidhan Nagar, Calcutta - 700 064

We have studied the gauge unification with the recent electroweak data as a function of the higgsino mass. It was shown that if the strong coupling constant is small ≈ 0.11 , consistent picture of gauge unification is not possible in the minimal supersymmetric standard model.

PACS number(s): 12.60.Jv, 12.10.Kt

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the testing ground of grand unified theories is the strict unification of the three coupling constants α_1, α_2 and α_s of the standard model $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ at some high scale (M_{GUT}), using as inputs their experimental values at the Z-pole mass. The coupling constants α_1 and α_2 can be determined from the accurate experimental measurement of α_{em} and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ at M_z pole mass. The world average values for M_z, α_{em} and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ are [1],

$$M_z = 91.184 \pm 0.0022 \quad (1a)$$

$$\alpha_{em}^{-1} = 127.9 \pm 0.09 \quad (1b)$$

$$\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.2315 \pm 0.0002 \pm 0.0003 \quad (1c)$$

The coupling constants α_1 and α_2 of the $U(1)_Y$ and $SU(2)_L$ gauge are related to α_{em} and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ as,

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{5}{3} \frac{\alpha_{em}}{\cos^2 \theta_W} \quad (2a)$$

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{\alpha_{em}}{\sin^2 \theta_W} \quad (2b)$$

The strong coupling constant (α_s) has also been measured, its world average value is; $\alpha_s(M_z) = 0.123 \pm 0.005$ [1]. Recently, it has been pointed out that QCD can not tolerate such a large α_s [2]. Several low energy experiments also indicate that α_s must be close to 0.11 [3], 3σ below the Z-peak value measured at collider experiments. Theoretically clean deep inelastic scattering experiments give $\alpha_s(M_z) = 0.112 \pm 0.005$ [4,5]. A new analysis of the Υ sum rule yield $\alpha_s(M_z) = 0.109 \pm 0.001$ [6]. Similar values are obtained in lattice QCD: $\alpha_s(m_z) = 0.110 \pm 0.006$ ($c\bar{c}$ spectrum) [7] and 0.115 ± 0.002 ($b\bar{b}$ spectrum) [8]. The apparent conflict between the low energy and the collider energy Z-peak determination of α_s may be due to the higher order corrections to the LEP values. Preliminary analysis suggests that these higher order correction may bring down the collider values to be consistent with the low energy measurements [9]. Indeed it has also been argued that the systematic error usually quoted in LEP number is grossly underestimated, and the LEP can only claim to determine the strong coupling constant within the limit, $0.10 \leq \alpha_s \leq 0.15$ [10].

It is now established that the standard model is inconsistent with gauge unification, with the experimentally measured coupling constants [11–13]. At early 90, the measurements were consistent with the gauge unification in the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) [11–13]. Recently Langacker and Polonsky [14] using the recent electroweak data found that in MSSM, $\alpha_s(M_z) \approx 0.129$ is required for strict gauge unification. This value is considerably higher than the world average value of $\alpha_s(M_z) = 0.123$. Also it is much above the low energy measurements and QCD motivated value of $\alpha_s(M_z) \approx 0.11$. In the context of MSSM the lower α_s require raising the SUSY particle masses considerably higher than the 1 TeV scale. However, SUSY mass spectra considerably higher than 1 TeV scale will have problem of diverging radiative correction. Also, heavy SUSY masses will be inconsistent with our expectation that the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) will be neutral and the candidate for the dark matter. The other possibility, to reconcile $\alpha_s \approx 0.11$ with gauge unification, is to assume very large negative heavy threshold correction at GUT scale and NRO's which could decrease $\alpha_s(M_z)$ by 10% [14–16]. Recently, Roszkowski and Shifman [18] argued that in the simple supersymmetric extension of the standard model, one need not have the constraint of universal gaugino masses at the GUT scale, which is, in general assumed in MSSM. To fully specify the MSSM, one needs to invoke the supersymmetry breaking pattern. The soft breaking term, which in essence couple the MSSM with the N=1 supergravity give rise to the constraint of universal gaugino masses at GUT scale. Thus in

a pure phenomenological approach, one can relax the condition of universal gaugino masses. They showed that by relaxing the constraint small α_s compatible with low energy measurements can be obtained [18]. In that case, gluino becomes lighter than the wino and can be well below 200 GeV [18]. However, the approach is unsatisfactory, as there is no theoretical scheme for the symmetry breaking term.

In the present paper, we show that consistent gauge unification with small α_s is not possible within the framework of MSSM. Our approach is phenomenological. We keep the constraint of universal gaugino masses. We treat the higgsino masses as a parameter of unification, and tune it to obtain unification for a given value of α_s . Gauge unification with $\alpha_s \approx 0.11$, require higgsino masses in the range of 10^6 GeV, three order of magnitude larger than other sparticle masses. Higgsino masses in the range of 10^6 GeV will require that the supersymmetry break at that scale only and the model will face the unsatisfactory aspect of gauge hierarchy problem.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2, we describe the model briefly, in section 3, the results obtained will be discussed. Summary and conclusions will be given in section 4.

II. MINIMAL SUPERSYMMETRIC STANDARD MODEL (MSSM)

The renormalisation group equations for the gauge couplings are given by (neglecting the small Yukawa couplings),

$$\frac{d\alpha_i^{-1}}{dt} = -\frac{b_i}{2\pi} - \sum_j \frac{b_{ij}\alpha_j}{8\pi^2}, i = 1, 3 \quad (3)$$

where $t = \ln(Q/M_{GUT})$, with Q the running scale and M_{GUT} the unification scale mass.

The one loop coefficients b_i of the β functions for the gauge couplings change across each new running mass threshold. In the MSSM they can be parameterized as [19–21],

$$b_1 = \frac{41}{10} + \frac{2}{5}\theta_{\tilde{H}} + \frac{1}{10}\theta_{H_2} + \frac{1}{5}\sum_{i=1}^3 \left[\frac{1}{12}(\theta_{\tilde{u}_{L_i}} + \theta_{\tilde{d}_{L_i}}) + \frac{4}{3}\theta_{\tilde{u}_{R_i}} + \frac{1}{3}\theta_{\tilde{d}_{R_i}} + \frac{1}{4}(\theta_{\tilde{e}_{L_i}} + \theta_{\tilde{\nu}_{L_i}}) + \theta_{\tilde{e}_{R_i}} \right] \quad (4a)$$

$$b_2 = -\frac{19}{6} + \frac{4}{3}\theta_{\tilde{W}} + \frac{2}{3}\theta_{\tilde{H}} + \frac{1}{6}\theta_{H_2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^3 [\theta_{\tilde{u}_{L_i}}\theta_{\tilde{d}_{L_i}} + \frac{1}{3}\theta_{\tilde{e}_{L_i}}\theta_{\tilde{\nu}_{L_i}}] \quad (4b)$$

$$b_3 = -7 + 2\theta_{\tilde{g}} + \frac{1}{6}\sum_{i=1}^3 [\theta_{\tilde{u}_{L_i}} + \theta_{\tilde{d}_{L_i}} + \theta_{\tilde{u}_{R_i}} + \theta_{\tilde{d}_{R_i}}] \quad (4c)$$

where $\theta_x \equiv \theta(Q^2 - m_x^2)$. In the above equations $\tilde{H}$ stands for the mass degenerate Higgsino fields, $\tilde{W}$ for the winos, the partner of the SU(2) gauge bosons ($M_{\tilde{W}} \equiv M_2$), $\tilde{g}$ is the gluino, the partner of the gluon, all are assumed to be mass eigen states in this approximation. The H_2 stands for the heavy Higgs boson doublet [21].

The effect of low mass threshold on two loop beta function is expected to be small. In the weak scale, we thus use the SM values:

$$b_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{199}{50} & \frac{27}{10} & \frac{44}{5} \\ \frac{9}{10} & \frac{35}{6} & 12 \\ \frac{11}{10} & \frac{9}{2} & -26 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

and from the weak to the GUT scale, we use,

$$b_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{199}{25} & \frac{27}{5} & \frac{88}{5} \\ \frac{9}{5} & 25 & 24 \\ \frac{11}{5} & 9 & -14 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

The RGE equations can be integrated in a step function approximation to obtain $\alpha_i(\mu')$ at a scale μ' for a given $\alpha_i(\mu)$,

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_i(\mu')} = \frac{1}{\alpha_i(\mu)} + \beta_0 \ln \frac{\mu'}{\mu} + \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0} \ln \frac{1/\alpha_i(\mu') + \beta_1/\beta_0}{1/\alpha_i(\mu) + \beta_1/\beta_0} \quad (7)$$

with

$$\beta_0 = -\frac{1}{2\pi}(b_i + \frac{b_{ij}}{4\pi}\alpha_j(\mu) + \frac{b_{ik}}{4\pi}\alpha_k(\mu)) \quad (8a)$$

$$\beta_1 = -\frac{2b_{ii}}{(4\pi)^2} \quad (8b)$$

The eq.7 can be solved iteratively to obtain the coupling constants at any arbitrary energy, knowing their value at a given energy.

In addition to the above equations, we consider the evolution of gaugino masses. Their evolution equations are simple,

$$\frac{dM_i}{dt} = -\frac{b_i}{4\pi}\alpha_i M_i \quad (9)$$

with the boundary condition at M_{GUT} : $M_i(t=0) = M_{1/2}$. The solution for the gluino and the winos can be written as,

$$M_{\tilde{W}} = \frac{\alpha_2(M_{\tilde{W}})}{\alpha_5} M_{1/2} \quad (10a)$$

$$M_{\tilde{g}} = \frac{\alpha_s(M_{\tilde{g}})}{\alpha_5} M_{1/2} \quad (10b)$$

where α_5 is the unified coupling constant at the GUT scale. Combining the two equations we obtain,

$$M_{\tilde{g}} = \frac{\alpha_s(M_{\tilde{g}})}{\alpha_2(M_{\tilde{W}})} M_{\tilde{W}} \quad (11)$$

For a given $M_{\tilde{W}}$, $M_{\tilde{g}}$ can be obtained iteratively from eq.11

The simple step-function approximation used to integrate the RG equations is justified only in the $\overline{DR}$ scheme. However, the experimental α_{em} and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ were obtained in the $\overline{MS}$ scheme. We therefore convert the coupling constants into the $\overline{DR}$ scheme by,

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_i^{\overline{DR}}} = \frac{1}{\alpha_i^{\overline{MS}}} - \frac{C_i}{12\pi} \quad (12)$$

where $C_1 = 0, C_2 = 2$ and $C_3 = 3$.

III. RESULTS

A. Higgsinos and gauge unification

We note that apart from the winos and the gluino, the beta function coefficients are most affected by the higgsinos. Not only they appear in two beta function b_1 and b_2 , compared to other sparticles, their coefficients are also larger. We therefore choose the higgsino mass as the parameter which will be tuned to obtain strict gauge unification with recent electroweak data. The wino and the gluino will be treated separately as they are connected by the universal gaugino mass at GUT scale. All the other SUSY masses will be assumed to be degenerate at a common mass (M_c). This is certainly an assumption, however, it helps to identify the role of higgsinos in the unification process.

We define the GUT scale (M_{GUT}) as the scale where all the three coupling constants unify at some value α_5 . The RG equations for α_1 , α_2 and α_3 were run simultaneously from M_z to M_{GUT} . The input α_1 and α_2 were calculated from the experimental α_{em} and $\sin^2 \theta_W$ (eq.1). We have used the central value for α_{em} . Unification of three forces is sensitive to the input value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$. This sensitivity is due to the fact that α_2 does not change much between M_z and M_{GUT} , as do the other two couplings. Thus a small change in $\sin^2 \theta_W$ has an enhanced effect on the unification. We therefore consider two input values of $\sin^2 \theta_W$: $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.232$, covering the 1σ variance. For the input strong coupling α_s , we choose a value between 0.10-0.13. For a given wino mass ($M_{\tilde{W}}$) and the common SUSY mass M_c we vary the higgsino mass ($M_{\tilde{H}}$) 100 GeV onwards to find the minimum $M_{\tilde{H}}$ required for the strict unification of the three couplings. The gluino mass was obtained iteratively from eq.11.

In fig.1a, we have shown the higgsino mass $M_{\tilde{H}}$ required to obtain strict gauge unification, as a function of the input α_s . The common SUSY particle mass (M_c) and the wino mass were fixed at 1000 GeV. The black dots and the open triangles correspond to $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231$ and $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.232$ respectively. The higgsino mass required for unification

shows a sensitive dependence on the input α_s . It also depends on the input $\sin^2 \theta_W$. For $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231$, the higgsino mass varies between 6.4×10^9 GeV to 4.5×10^{13} GeV, as α_s changes from 0.10 to 0.13. The higgsino mass is lowered approximately by a factor of 10, if $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.232$. It then varies between 8.2×10^8 GeV to 6×10^2 GeV. In fig.1b and 1c, we have shown the unification scale (M_{GUT}) and the inverse of the unified coupling (α_5^{-1}). We note that they are anti-correlated. While M_{GUT} increases, α_5^{-1} decreases with the input α_s . In comparison to the higgsino mass, M_{GUT} is quite insensitive to the input α_s . As α_s changes from 0.10 to 0.13, the GUT scale is increased by a factor of 2 only. Similarly, α_5^{-1} also shows weak dependence on the input α_s . It is changed by less than 10%. Dependence of the GUT scale on the input $\sin^2 \theta_W$ is also manifest. Within 1σ variation of $\sin^2 \theta_W$, it is changed approximately by 10%. Interestingly, the unified coupling do not show appreciable dependence on the input $\sin^2 \theta_W$. In fig.1d, the ratio $M_{\tilde{g}}/M_{\tilde{W}}$ is shown. Within 1σ variation of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ the gluino mass also do not show appreciable dependence on the input value of the Weinberg angle. However, as input α_s varies from 0.10 to 0.13, it increases from 2300 GeV to 2800 GeV, showing weak dependence on the input α_s . In fig.1e, we have depicted the variation of the universal gaugino mass $M_{1/2}$. $M_{1/2}$ also do not show appreciable dependence on the input $\sin^2 \theta_W$. It shows weak dependence on the input α_s , increasing from 1.15×10^3 GeV to 1.23×10^3 GeV, as α_s changes from 0.10 to 0.13.

The results discussed so far indicate that while the higgsino mass shows a sensitive dependence to the input α_s for strict unification, (it changes by 6 order of magnitude as α_s changes from 0.10 to 0.13) other parameters of the model, e.g. M_{GUT} , α_5 , $M_{\tilde{g}}$ and $M_{1/2}$ shows a weak dependence on the input α_s . Also, unlike the higgsino mass, the input dependence of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ is also less in those parameters. With the world average value of $\alpha_s = 0.123$, strict unification is possible with Higgsino mass as well as all the other sparticle masses in the range of TeV scale. However, if we consider the QCD motivated small $\alpha_s \approx 0.11$, strict unification is obtained with Higgsino masses in the range of $10^6 - 10^7$ GeV. All the other SUSY masses can be in the TeV scale. To be specific, for $\alpha_s = 0.11$, strict gauge unification is obtained with $M_{\tilde{H}} = 1.46 \times 10^7 (2.15 \times 10^6)$ GeV for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231 (0.232)$.

In the above calculations, the mass of the winos ($M_{\tilde{W}}$) were fixed at 1000 GeV. To observe the effect of wino mass on the unification, with small α_s , we now vary $M_{\tilde{W}}$ from 100 GeV to 2000 GeV. We fix the strong coupling at $\alpha_s = 0.11$. The common SUSY mass M_c was fixed at 1000 GeV. As before, while the central value was used for α_{em} , for $\sin^2 \theta_W$, we consider variation within 1σ . In fig.2, the results are shown. In fig.2a, the higgsino mass required for strict unification is shown as a function of the wino mass. As observed earlier, the higgsino mass depends on the input $\sin^2 \theta_W$. Within its 1σ variation, it is changed approximately by a factor of 10. However, the higgsino mass required for unification shows a weak dependence on the wino mass. As the wino mass is varied from 100 to 2000 GeV, the higgsino mass is decreased by a factor of 5 only. Interestingly, we find that after 1000 GeV, the higgsino mass remains nearly same. Variation of the GUT scale and inverse of the unified coupling with the wino mass is shown in fig.2b and 2c. As before, they are anti-correlated. While M_{GUT} shows weak dependence on the input $\sin^2 \theta_W$, α_5^{-1} do not exhibit any such dependence. Their dependence on the wino mass is also weak. Here also, after $M_{\tilde{W}} = 1000$ GeV, rate of variation of M_{GUT} and α_5^{-1} slows down. The variation of the ratio $M_{\tilde{g}}/M_{\tilde{W}}$ with the wino mass is shown in fig.2d. The ratio do not depend on the input $\sin^2 \theta_W$. It decreases with the wino mass. Again after 1000 GeV, the rate of decrease is slowed down and the relation $M_{\tilde{g}} \approx 2.5 M_{\tilde{W}}$ become valid. In fig.2e, the universal gaugino mass $M_{1/2}$ and its variation with the wino mass is shown. $M_{1/2}$ do not show any dependence on the input $\sin^2 \theta_W$. As expected, it increases linearly with the wino mass. The results indicate that the unification of three forces with $\alpha_s = 0.11$ depend weakly upon the wino mass. Increasing the wino mass beyond 1000 GeV, does not affect the unification appreciably.

We have also studied the dependence of the common SUSY mass M_c on the unification process with $\alpha_s = 0.11$. The wino mass was fixed at 1000 GeV. In fig.3a, the variation of the higgsino mass with M_c is shown. The input dependence of $\sin^2 \theta_W$ on the higgsino mass is again manifest. The higgsino mass shows a very weak dependence on the common SUSY mass M_c . Similarly, the GUT scale (fig.3b), the unified coupling (fig.3c), the ratio $M_{\tilde{g}}/M_{\tilde{W}}$ (fig.3d) and $M_{1/2}$ (fig.3e) shows very weak dependence on the input M_c . Thus the unification of three forces with $\alpha_s = 0.11$ is insensitive to the common SUSY mass M_c within the range 500-2500 GeV. Thus a more accurate SUSY mass spectra will not alter the present results significantly.

The present analysis indicate that low energy QCD motivated strong coupling constant $\alpha_s \approx 0.11$ is consistent with gauge unification in MSSM, if the higgsino masses are in the range of $10^6 - 10^7$ GeV and other SUSY masses are in the TeV range. In the following we will examine its effect on some other features of the model.

B. Color triplet Higgs mass

Any GUT theory must consider the nucleon decay rate in the model. As the GUT scale obtained presently exceeds 10^{15} GeV, we do not expect problem from the direct proton decay $p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0$. However, nucleons can decay via exchange of color-triplet Higgs multiplet [22,23], through the dimension five operator. The color triplet Higgs mass

M_{H_c} , then has significant observable effect. The lower bound on M_{H_c} from nucleon-decay experiments can be obtained as [24],

$$M_{H_c} \geq 5.3 \times 10^{15} \text{ GeV} \quad (13)$$

We have calculated the color triplet Higgs mass in our model. Following [24,25], we write at the GUT scale,

$$(3\alpha_2^{-1} - 2\alpha_3^{-1} - \alpha_1^{-1})(M_{GUT}) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{12}{5} \ln \frac{M_{H_c}}{M_{GUT}} - 2 \ln \frac{M_{SUSY}}{\Lambda} \right) \quad (14)$$

The first term of the rhs corresponds to heavy threshold correction at GUT scale as a function of the color triplet higgs mass M_{H_c} [24,25]. The second term is the light threshold correction at the weak scale (Λ). (We note that in the calculations presented at earlier sections, we have not taken into account the heavy threshold effects. However, if the heavy thresholds are much heavier than the GUT scale, then the results obtained previously will not be altered). For strict unification at the GUT scale, the lhs of the above equation is zero and we can find the color triplet Higgs mass in terms of the SUSY masses. In the above equation all the SUSY particles are assumed to be degenerate at a common mass M_{SUSY} . However, as we have treated the winos, gluino and the higgsinos separately, the second term is to be replaced by

$$2 \ln \frac{M_{SUSY}}{\Lambda} \rightarrow 4 \ln \frac{M_{\tilde{W}}}{M_{\tilde{g}}} + \frac{2}{5} \ln \frac{M_c}{\Lambda} + \frac{8}{5} \ln \frac{M_{\tilde{H}}}{\Lambda} \quad (15)$$

In fig.4, we have shown the variation of the color triplet Higgs mass M_{H_c} with the wino mass $M_{\tilde{W}}$ as obtained from strict gauge unification. The strong coupling was fixed at 0.11. The common SUSY mass M_c was fixed at 1000 GeV. As discussed earlier, for a given wino mass the unification was obtained by varying the higgsino mass only. Color triplet higgs mass depend on the input value of $\sin^2 \theta_W$, lower $\sin^2 \theta_W$ results in a higher value for the color triplet Higgs mass. Within 1σ , the value is changed approximately by a factor of 10. M_{H_c} also depend on the wino mass. As the wino mass is increased its value is decreased. However, 1000 GeV onwards, the rate of decrease is slowed down. We observe that the color triplet Higgs mass M_{H_c} as obtained presently is much above the lower limit (5.3×10^{15} GeV) required to respect the experimental nucleon decay rate. The result suggest that large higgsino mass will not cause rapid proton decay through the dimension five operator.

C. LSP and dark matter

About the LSP being the candidate dark matter, we observe that the higgsinos mixes with gauginos (both are spin 1/2 particle) to give the neutralino's. In the limiting case when M_1, M_2 and $M_{\tilde{H}}$ $\rightarrow$ M_z , the bino and the neutral wino do not mix with each other nor they mix with the higgsinos. Thus binos can still be the LSP and the candidate for the dark matter. Thus if only the higgsinos are in the mass range $10^6 - 10^7$ GeV, and all the other s-particles are in the TeV range, the model will not suffer from radiative correction at the electroweak scale. Also the expectation that bino's are the dark matter candidate need not be altered.

D. Gauge hierarchy problem

One of the motivation of introducing the supersymmetry is the gauge hierarchy problem, i.e. existence of very small and large mass scale in nature. In SU(5), as well known, the tree level parameters needed to be fine tuned to an accuracy of 10^{-26} or so, in order to obtain the mass ratio $M_x/m_W \approx 10^{12}$. However, tree level fine tunings are upset at higher order due to quadratic radiative corrections and SU(5) is in problem. This need not happen in supersymmetric theories due to the nonrenormalisation theorem of Grisaru, Rocek and Siegel [26]. According to this theory, which is valid for exact or softly broken supersymmetry, the parameters of the super potential do not only receive infinite renormalisation but they also do not receive finite renormalisation in higher orders. Thus the parameters, once fine tuned at tree level to obtain hierarchy, the radiative correction donot disturb the hierarchy at higher order. Thus problem of gauge hierarchy in supersymmetric model is not as severe as in SU(5). Also, in supersymmetric theories, logarithmic dependence of radiative corrections makes the emergence of high mass scale from a low mass scale quite natural.

However, with the Higgsino mass in the scale of 10^6 GeV, effective breaking of supersymmetry will occur at that scale only. The effective theory below that scale will not be protected by the non-renormalisation theory. Quadratic divergences will be generated in Higgs mass due to absence of Higgs-Higgsino-gaugino coupling at low energy. With

Higgsino mass in the range of 10^6 GeV, the corrections to the Higgs mass will be of that scale and correct electroweak scale can not be achieved without fine tuning. Thus we find that if the strong coupling constant is small as obtained in QCD experiments, gauge unification with recent electroweak data can be achieved, alongwith universal gaugino masses, only if we abandon one of the primary motivation of supersymmetry, namely the resolution to the gauge hierarchy problem. Also generating three order of hierarchy among the sparticles will be difficult to obtain in any theoretical framework. The discussion suggests that consistent gauge unification with $\alpha_s \approx 0.11$ is not possible within the frame work of MSSM.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the gauge unification in the MSSM with respect to the higgsino masses. The purpose of our study was to find whether with $\alpha_s \approx 0.11$ gauge unification is possible in the MSSM with universal gaugino mass at GUT scale. Our approach is phenomenological. We choose the higgsino mass as a parameter. For a given wino mass, it was tuned to obtain gauge unification. The gluino mass was obtained iteratively from the condition that at GUT scale the winos and the gluino have a common mass $M_{1/2}$. All the other sparticle masses were assumed to be degenerate at a common mass M_c . The RG equations were run from M_z to the GUT scale, with the beta function coefficients changing at appropriate masses. We find that if α_s ranges between 0.10 to 0.13, with the recent electroweak data, it is possible to unify all the three forces by varying the higgsino mass between $10^9 - 10^3$ GeV. All the other sparticles can be in the TeV scale. The result is insensitive to the wino mass or the common mass M_c . Thus a more accurate SUSY spectra will not alter the results significantly. It was found that if $\alpha_s \approx 0.11$, as measured in QCD experiments, gauge unification require higgsino masses in the range of 10^6 GeV, three order of magnitude higher than other sparticle masses. Colour triplet Higgs were also calculated and found to be heavy enough to forbid rapid proton decay. However, with Higgsino masses in the scale of 10^6 GeV, supersymmetry breaks at that scale only and problem of gauge hierarchy resurface. One of the fundamental motivation of introducing supersymmetry is then lost.

To conclude, if α_s is indeed small, as measured in QCD experiments, then consistent gauge unification within MSSM is not possible. However, MSSM is merely the simplest extension of standard model with supersymmetry. It is possible that with a more complicated model a consistent picture will emerge.

* akc@veccal.ernet.in

- [1] Review of particle physics, Particle data group, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 1 (1996).
- [2] M. Shifman, Mod. Phys. Lett.A **10**, 605(1995).
- [3] G. Altarelli, in QCD- 20 Years Later, Proceedings of the Workshop, Aachen, Germany,1992, edited by P.Zerwas and H. Kastrup (World Scientific. Singapore, 1993), vol.1,p.172; S. Bethke, in QCD '94, Proceedings of the international conference, Montpellier, France, 1994, edited by S. Narison [Nucl. Phys. B(Proc. Suppl.)**39B** (1995).
- [4] M. Virchaux and A. Milsztajn, Phys. Lett. B **274**, 221 (1992).
- [5] A. Martin, W. Stirling and R. Roberts, Phys. Lett. B**354**, 155 (1995).
- [6] M. Voloshin, Int. J. Mod. Phys.A**10**, 2865 (1995).
- [7] A.X. El-Khadra, G. Hockney, A. Kronfeld and P. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. Lett. , **69**, 729 (1992).
- [8] C. Davies, K. Hornbostel, G.P.Lepage, A. Lidsey, J. Shigemitsu and J. Sloan, Phys. Lett. B**345**, 42(1995).
- [9] J. Ellis, D.V. Nanopoulos and D. Ross, Phys. Lett. B **267**, 132 (1991).
- [10] M. Consoli and F. Ferroni, Phys. Lett. B**349**, 375 (1995).
- [11] U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Furstenau, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 447 (1991).
- [12] J. Ellis, S. Kelly and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 131 (1991).
- [13] P. Langacker and M.X. Luo Phys. Rev. D **44**, 817 (1991).
- [14] P. Langacker and N. Polonsky, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 3081 (1995).
- [15] D. Ring, S. Urano and R. Arnowitt, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 6623 (1995).
- [16] T. Dasgupta, P. Mambres and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5366 (1995).
- [17] L. Clavelli and P. W. Coulter, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 3913 (1995).
- [18] L.Roszkowski and M. Shifman, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 404 (1996).
- [19] R.G. Roberts and G.G. Ross, Nucl. Phys.B**377**, 571 (1992).
- [20] J.Ellis, S. Kelly and D.V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B**373**, 55 (1992); Phys. Lett. B**287**, 95 (1992); J. Hisano, H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1014 (1992).
- [21] G. Kane, C. Kolda, L. Roszkowski and J. Wells, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 6173 (1994).

- [22] N. Sakai and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. **B197**, 533 (1982).
- [23] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 287 (1982).
- [24] J. Hisano, H. Murayama and T. Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. **B402**, 46 (1993).
- [25] C. D. Carone, H. Murayama, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 1658 (1996).
- [26] M. T. Grisara, M. Rocek and W. Siegel, Nucl. Phys. **B159**, 429 (1979).

FIG. 1. Variation of (a) the higgsino mass ($M_{\tilde{H}}$), (b) the unification scale (M_{GUT}), (c) the inverse of the unified coupling (α_5^{-1}), (d) the ratio $M_{\tilde{g}}/M_{\tilde{W}}$ and (e) the universal gaugino mass ($M_{1/2}$), with the strong coupling $\alpha_s(M_z)$ is shown. The wino mass $M_{\tilde{W}}$ and the common SUSY mass M_c was fixed at 1000 GeV. The black dots are for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231$ and the open triangles are for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.232$.

FIG. 2. Variation of (a) the higgsino mass ($M_{\tilde{H}}$), (b) the unification scale (M_{GUT}), (c) the inverse of the unified coupling (α_5^{-1}), (d) the ratio $M_{\tilde{g}}/M_{\tilde{H}}$ and (e) the universal gaugino mass ($M_{1/2}$), with the the wino mass ($M_{\tilde{W}}$) is shown. The strong coupling was fixed at $\alpha_s(M_z) = 0.11$. The common SUSY mass M_c was fixed at 1000 GeV. The black dots are for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231$ and the open triangles are for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.232$.

FIG. 3. Variation of (a) the higgsino mass ($M_{\tilde{H}}$), (b) the unification scale (M_{GUT}), (c) the inverse of the unified coupling (α_5^{-1}), (d) the ratio $M_{\tilde{g}}/M_{\tilde{H}}$ and (e) the universal gaugino mass ($M_{1/2}$), with the the common SUSY mass (M_c) is shown. The strong coupling was fixed at $\alpha_s(M_z) = 0.11$. The wino mass M_c was fixed at 1000 GeV. The black dots are for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231$ and the open triangles are for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.232$.

FIG. 4. Variation of the color triplet Higgs mass (M_{H_c}), with the the wino mass ($M_{\tilde{W}}$) is shown. The strong coupling was fixed at $\alpha_s(M_z) = 0.11$. The common SUSY mass M_c was fixed at 1000 GeV. The black dots are for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231$ and the open triangles are for $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.232$.







